UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,879	09/19/2003	Sujoy Basu	200310470-1	6772

22879   7590   05/30/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
LEMMA, SAMSON B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/30/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2008*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on February 13, 2008. Every independent claims 1, 11 and 21 is amended. Claims 1-29 **are pending/examined.**

2.   The amendment made to the respective independent claims 1, 11 and 21 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection set forth in the previous office action. Thus the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection **set forth in the** previous office action is withdrawn.

Priority

3.   This application does not claim priority. Therefore, the effective filling data for the subject matter defined in the pending claims of this application is 09/19/2003.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's remark/arguments filed on February 13, 2008 regarding **claims 1-29** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. NOTE: **(As a result of applicant's amendment made to each independent claim 1.11 and 21, the claims becomes not only broader but also becomes identical as that of the original claims. Thus new ground of rejection/s is made which is the same as the pervious final office action.)**

Applicant argument is based on the reference/s used in rejecting the corresponding limitation recited in the independent claims 1, 11 and 21.

Applicant's representative argument is similar to the argument filed on May 11, 2007.

Applicant in particular argued that the limitation recited as, **"user account is customized based on said user polices to limit access to resources on a remote desktop"**, is not disclosed by the references used, namely Bertram.

In order to support his argument, Applicant wrote the following.

"Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that "customized" as taught by Bertram requires "the administrator thus customizes the login window by entering appropriate control information. Customizing by **Bertram is a manual customization** *based on the administrators input. In opposition, embodiments of the present invention customize "based on said user policies," which is very different from an administrator populating data to customize an account."*

Examiner disagrees with the above argument.

Examiner would point out that Bertram discloses the following on column 8, lines 57-61 indicating the fact that the customizing is also done by the users other than *administrator.*

"Thus, for example, if the administrator sets an appropriate policy, a user may enter or "<u>customize</u>" his or her own particular authentication location(s), Which significantly enhances the flexibility of the overall system."[See column 8, lines 57-61]

Furthermore it is known in the art that users with administrative

privileges have the privilege to perform tasks performed by the

administrator. Therefore the two terms , namely "user" and

"administrator" can be interchangeably used unless and otherwise

the claim explicitly indicates the fact that the limitation recited as

"user/s" can not be *"administrator"*.

Examiner further would point the limitation does not recite *"Customizing*

user account dynamically." As argued by applicant, rather the limitation is

recited as follows. "providing a dynamic user account to said user,

wherein said dynamic user account is customized based on said user

policies to limit access to resources on a remote desktop."

And Bertram on column 3, lines 57-59 discloses the following indicating

that the user account is a dynamic user account rather than a manually

entered account.

"FIG. 8 is a flowchart illustrating **how a user account is established**

dynamically following authentication of the user" [see column 3, lines

57-59]

Furthermore, Examiner would point out that on column 9, lines 42-

64, Bertram discloses the following which meets the limitation recited as

"providing a dynamic user account to said user."

"Turning now to FIG. 8, a flowchart is shown of the next step according

to the present invention, namely, the establishment of a user account at

the client. This was step 40 in FIG. 4. **The user account is dynamically**

established at the client machine in a format of the native operating

system. Thus, in the preferred embodiment, a Windows NT user account

is established at the client machine after authentication (which may be,

as noted above, from a non-native server domain). The routine to

dynamically create an NT user begins at step 84 to test whether

notification of a successful authentication has been received from the

server. If the outcome of the test at step 84 is negative, the routine

cycles. If, however, the outcome of the test at step 84 is positive, the

routine continues to create a new NT user on that machine (or update an

existing account) at step 85 and to associate a set of access rights to the

new (or updated) user account. To this end, the routine continues at step

86 by issuing a request to the server (at which the client was

authenticated) to retrieve unique user information and, further, to

identify each group to which the user is a member. Although not meant

to be limiting, a particular "group" is merely a collection of users that

have defined access rights according to some policy."**[See column 9,

lines 42-64]**

In order to show how each and every limitation of the independent

claims disclosed by the reference/s the examiner would show the

following.

<u>**As per independent claims 1, 11 and 21**</u> **Bertram discloses a**

method for controlling remote desktop access provided by an

interactive

grid computing system comprising:

- **Determining user policies** *(see on column 11, lines 52-column 12, lines 26, "the different settings for the policy")* **based on a classification of a user** *(user allows access to local resources based on group membership or also see "roaming user group on the Windows NT)* ; [column 11, lines 52-column 12, line 26 and see figure 8, ref. Num "86"]

and

- **providing a dynamic user account to said user, [Column 11, lines 42-51 and column 12, lines 18-26]** (*The present invention thus implements "dynamic" local accounts on the client machine.* ***A dynamic local account is a user account that is created*** *on the local Windows NT workstation when a user logs on to a location other than a Windows NT. As discussed above, a local account is created after the user is successfully authenticated on the remote logon server. The account gives the user valid security credentials on the local workstation. And on column 12, lines 18-26, the following has also been disclosed. "This is determined by checking to see if the user is part of the Roaming Users group on the Windows NT client. This was set as part of* ***the dynamic creation of the user account.****" And on column 15, lines 48-52, the following has been disclosed, "The domain drivers are the modules that provide a set of common functions used by authentication, discovery, user profile storage and retrieval, logoff,* ***dynamic user account creation****, and dynamic user account management.")*

- **wherein said dynamic user account is customized based on said user policies to limit access to resources on a remote desktop.**

*(See figure 14, "**customize** the list of other domains…" and column 8, lines 54-61 and column 9, lines 17-26 and claim 8, see, Applying a set of one or more policies to **customize** the list prior to presenting the list to a user seeking authentication. And on column 11, lines 42-51, the following has been disclosed. "A **dynamic local account** is a user account that is created on the local Windows NT workstation when a user logs on to a location other than a Windows NT. As discussed above, a local account is created after the user is successfully authenticated **on the remote logon server.**"* Furthermore on column 8, lines 57-61 the following is disclosed indicating the fact that the customizing is also done by the users other than *administrator*. "**Thus, for example, if the administrator sets an appropriate policy, a user may enter or "_customize_" his or her own particular authentication location(s), Which significantly enhances the flexibility of the overall system.**"[See column 8, lines 57-61] Applicant's representative is encouraged to initiate interview to discuss how examiner interprets the claim language and how the claim limitation/s could be written to overcome the ground of rejection/s set forth in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   **Claims 1-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bertram et al (hereinafter referred as Bertram)(U.S. Patent No. 6, 418,466) (Published on 07/09/2002)

7.   **As per independent claims 1, 11 and 21   Bertram discloses a method for controlling remote desktop access provided by an interactive**

grid computing system comprising:

●   **Determining user policies** *(see on column 11, lines 52-column 12, lines 26, "the different settings for the policy")* **based on a classification of a user** *(user allows access to local resources based on group membership or also see "roaming user group on the Windows NT)* ; [column 11, lines 52-column 12, line 26 and see figure 8, ref. Num "86"]

and

●   **providing a dynamic user account to said user, [Column 11, lines 42-51 and column 12, lines 18-26]** (*The present invention thus implements "dynamic" local accounts on the client machine. **A dynamic local account is a user account that is created** on the local Windows NT workstation when a user logs on to a location other than a Windows NT. As discussed above, a local account is created after the user is successfully authenticated on the remote logon server. The account gives the user valid security credentials on the local workstation. And on*

column 12, lines 18-26, the following has also been disclosed. "This is

determined by checking to see if the user is part of the Roaming Users

*group on the Windows NT client. This was set as part of **the dynamic***

creation of the user account." *And on column 15, lines 48-52, the*

following has been disclosed, "The domain drivers are the modules that

provide a set of common functions used by authentication, discovery, user

*profile storage and retrieval, logoff, **dynamic user account creation**, and*

dynamic user account management.")

- **wherein said dynamic user account is customized based on
said user policies to limit access to resources on a remote desktop.**
*(See figure 14, "**customize** the list of other domains..." and column 8, lines*

54-61 and column 9, lines 17-26 and claim 8, see, Applying a set of one or

*more policies to **customize** the list prior to presenting the list to a user*

seeking authentication. And on column 11, lines 42-51, the following has

*been disclosed. "A **dynamic local account** is a user account that is*

created on the local Windows NT workstation when a user logs on to a

location other than a Windows NT. As discussed above, a local account is

*created after the user is successfully authenticated **on the remote logon***

server.")

8   <u>**As per dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 and 22-29**</u> **Bertram
discloses a method as applied to claims above. Furthermore,
Bertram discloses the method further comprising editing a desktop
configuration file based on said dynamic user account to limit
access only to user authorized icons on said remote desktop and**

displaying authorized icons on said remote desktop. *[See Bertram, on figures 3, 13-14 and Column 11, lines 42-51 and column 12, lines 18-26, and all the rest of the claims recited about "remote desktop" are inherent features of Windows XP, see Remote Desktop, from Geek.com)*

Conclusion

9   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samson B Lemma whose telephone number is 571-272-3806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 am---4: 30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BARRON JR GILBERTO can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

05/15/2008

/Samson B Lemma/
Examiner, Art Unit 2132

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132

Application Number	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination
	10/665,879	BASU ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Samson B. Lemma	2132